

Bounded Linear Logic, Revisited

Ugo Dal Lago*

Martin Hofmann†

April 17, 2009

Abstract

We present QBAL, an extension of Girard, Scedrov and Scott’s bounded linear logic. The main novelty of the system is the possibility of quantifying over resource variables. This generalization makes bounded linear logic considerably more flexible, while preserving soundness and completeness for polynomial time. In particular, we provide compositional embeddings of Leivant’s RRW and Hofmann’s LFPL into QBAL.

1 Introduction

After two decades from the pioneering works that started it [3, 12, 13], implicit computational complexity is now an active research area at the intersection of mathematical logic and computer science. Its aim is the study of machine-free characterizations of complexity classes. The correspondence between an ICC system and a complexity class holds *extensionally*, i.e., the class of functions (or problems) which are representable in the system equals the complexity class. Usually, the system is a fragment or subsystem of a larger programming language or logical system, the *base system*, in which other functions besides the ones in the complexity class can be represented. Sometimes, one of the two inclusions is shown by proving that any program (or proof) can be reduced in bounded time; in this case, we say that the system is intensionally sound. On the other hand, ICC systems are very far from being intensionally *complete*: there are many programs (or proofs) in the base system which are not in the ICC system, even if they can be evaluated with the prescribed complexity bounds. Observe that this does not contradict extensional completeness, since many different programs or proofs compute the same function.

Of course, a system that captures all and only the programs of the base system running within a prescribed complexity bound will in all but trivial cases (e.g., empty base system) fail to be recursively enumerable. Thus, in practice, one strives to improve intensional expressivity by capturing important classes of examples and patterns.

An obstacle towards applying ICC characterizations of complexity classes to programming language theory is their poor intensional expressive power: most ICC systems do not capture natural programs and therefore are not useful in practice. This problem has been already considered in the literature. Some papers try to address the poor intensional expressive power of ICC systems by defining new programming languages allowing to program in ways which are not allowed in existing ICC systems. This includes quasi-interpretations [14] and LFPL by the second author [9]. Other papers analyze the intensional expressive power of existing systems either by studying necessary conditions on captured programs or, more frequently, by studying relations between existing ICC systems. One nice example is Murawski and Ong’s paper [15], in which the authors prove that there cannot be any embedding (satisfying certain properties) of Bellantoni and Cook function algebra BC [3] into light affine logic [1]. In this work, we somehow combine the two approaches, by showing that a new logical system, called QBAL is intensionally at least as expressive as two heterogeneous, existing systems, namely Leivant’s RRW [13] and LFPL.

*Dipartimento di Scienze dell’Informazione, Università di Bologna

†Institut für Informatik, LMU München

QBAL is a generalization of Girard, Scedrov and Scott's bounded linear logic (BLL, [7]), itself the first characterization of polynomial time computable functions as a fragment of Girard's linear logic [5]. Bounded linear logic has received relatively little attention in the past [10, 16]. This is mainly due to its syntax, which is more involved than the one of other complexity-related fragments of linear logic appeared more recently [6, 11, 4].

In bounded linear logic, polynomials are part of the syntax and, as a consequence, computation time is controlled explicitly. However, it seems that BLL is not as intensionally expressive as to be able to embed any existing ICC system corresponding to polynomial time (except Lafont's SLL [11], which anyway was conceived as a very small fragment of BLL). QBAL is obtained by endowing BLL with bounded quantification on resource variables. In other words, formulas of QBAL includes the ones of BLL, plus formulas like $\exists x : \{x \leq y^2\}.A$ or $\forall x, y : \{x \leq z, y \leq z^3\}.B$. This new feature by itself increases the intensional expressive power: both RRW and LFPL can be compositionally embedded into QBAL. Moreover, QBAL remains sound with respect to polynomial time. For these reasons, QBAL is *not* just another system capturing polynomial time computable functions.

2 Syntax

In this Section, we present the syntax of QBAL, together with some of its main properties. In the following, we adhere to the notation adopted in the relevant literature on BLL [7, 10].

2.1 Resource Polynomials and Constraints

We will work with the set $\mathbb{N}$ of natural numbers.

Definition 2.1 • A resource monomial is any finite product of binomial coefficients

$$\prod_{i=1}^m \binom{x_i}{n_i}$$

where the variables $x_1, \dots, x_m$ are distinct and $n_1, \dots, n_m$ are integer constants.

- A resource polynomial is any finite sum of monomials. $FV(p)$ denotes the set of variables in a resource polynomial p .

Lemma 2.1 Resource polynomials are closed under sum, product and composition.

Order relations between resource polynomials are captured by constraints and constraint sets:

Definition 2.2 (Constraints) • A constraint is an inequality in the form $p \leq q$, where p and q are resource polynomials. A constraint set is a finite set of constraints. Constraint sets are denoted with letters like $\mathcal{C}$ or $\mathcal{D}$. $p < q$ stands for $p \leq q + 1$.

- For each constraint set $\mathcal{C}$, we define an order $\sqsubseteq_{\mathcal{C}}$ on resource polynomials by imposing $p \sqsubseteq_{\mathcal{C}} q$ iff $\mathcal{C} \models p \leq q$, i.e., the (pointwise) inequality $p \leq q$ is a logical consequence of $\mathcal{C}$.
- $\mathcal{C} \models \mathcal{D}$ iff $\mathcal{C} \models p \leq q$ for every constraint $p \leq q$ in $\mathcal{D}$.

2.2 Formulas

Resource polynomials, constraints and constraint sets becomes, in turn, the essential ingredients in the definition of QBAL formulas:

Definition 2.3 Formulas of QBAL are defined as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} A ::= & \alpha(p_1, \dots, p_n) \mid A \otimes A \mid A \multimap A \mid \forall \alpha. A \mid !_{x < p} A \mid \\ & \forall (x_1, \dots, x_n) : \mathcal{C}. A \mid \exists (x_1, \dots, x_n) : \mathcal{C}. A \end{aligned}$$

where $x \notin FV(p)$, α ranges over a countable class of atoms (each with an arity n). We will restrict ourselves to bounded first order quantification. In other words, whenever we write $\forall(x_1, \dots, x_n) : \mathcal{C}.A$ or $\exists(x_1, \dots, x_n) : \mathcal{C}.A$ we implicitly assume that for every i there is a resource polynomial p_i not containing the variables $x_1, \dots, x_n$ such that $\mathcal{C} \models \{x_1 \leq p_1, \dots, x_n \leq p_n\}$. α is bound in $\forall\alpha.A$, x is bound in $!_{x < p}A$ and $x_1, \dots, x_n$ are bound in $\forall(x_1, \dots, x_n) : \mathcal{C}.A$ and $\exists(x_1, \dots, x_n) : \mathcal{C}.A$

Checking the boundedness condition on formulas is undecidable in general (but here, we are not concerned about the complexity of QBAL as a verification technique). Notice that resource polynomials and the variables in them can occur inside constraints, constraint sets and formulas. The following definition becomes natural:

Definition 2.4 (Positive and Negative Occurrences) • Any variable in p (respectively, in q) occurs negatively (respectively, positively) in the constraint $p \leq q$. Analogously for constraint sets.

- The definition of a positive (or negative) occurrence of a variable in a formula A is defined by induction on A :
 - All the variables in $FV(p_1) \cup \dots \cup FV(p_n)$ occur positively in $\alpha(p_1, \dots, p_n)$.
 - Polarities are propagated through compound formulas by noting that $\multimap$ is negative in the first slot, $!_{x < p}$ is negative in p and $\forall \bar{x} : \mathcal{C}$ is negative in $\mathcal{C}$. All other slots are positive. For example, the first occurrence of x in $\forall y : \{y \leq x\}.\alpha(x, y)$ is negative while the second one is positive. We omit the detailed definition.
- Let B be a formula where the free variables $x_1, \dots, x_n$ occur only positively. Then $A\{B/\alpha(x_1, \dots, x_n)\}$ denotes the formula obtained by replacing every free occurrence of $\alpha(p_1, \dots, p_n)$ with $B\{p_1/x_1, \dots, p_n/x_n\}$ inside A .
- The order $\sqsubseteq_{\mathcal{C}}$ can be extended to an order on formulae as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
\alpha(p_1, \dots, p_n) &\sqsubseteq_{\mathcal{C}} \alpha(q_1, \dots, q_n) \text{ iff } \forall i. p_i \sqsubseteq_{\mathcal{C}} q_i \\
A \otimes B &\sqsubseteq_{\mathcal{C}} C \otimes D \text{ iff } A \sqsubseteq_{\mathcal{C}} C \wedge B \sqsubseteq_{\mathcal{C}} D \\
A \multimap B &\sqsubseteq_{\mathcal{C}} C \multimap D \text{ iff } C \sqsubseteq_{\mathcal{C}} A \wedge B \sqsubseteq_{\mathcal{C}} D \\
\forall \alpha. A &\sqsubseteq_{\mathcal{C}} \forall \alpha. B \text{ iff } A \sqsubseteq_{\mathcal{C}} B \\
!_{x < p} A &\sqsubseteq_{\mathcal{C}} !_{x < q} B \text{ iff } q \sqsubseteq_{\mathcal{C}} p \wedge x \notin FV(\mathcal{C}) \wedge A \sqsubseteq_{\mathcal{C} \cup \{x < p\}} B \\
\forall \bar{x} : \mathcal{D}. A &\sqsubseteq_{\mathcal{C}} \forall \bar{x} : \mathcal{E}. B \text{ iff } \mathcal{C} \cup \mathcal{E} \models \mathcal{D} \wedge \bar{x} \notin FV(\mathcal{C}) \wedge A \sqsubseteq_{\mathcal{C} \cup \mathcal{D}} B \\
\exists \bar{x} : \mathcal{D}. A &\sqsubseteq_{\mathcal{C}} \exists \bar{x} : \mathcal{E}. B \text{ iff } \mathcal{C} \cup \mathcal{D} \models \mathcal{E} \wedge \bar{x} \notin FV(\mathcal{C}) \wedge A \sqsubseteq_{\mathcal{C} \cup \mathcal{E}} B
\end{aligned}$$

A QBAL judgement is an expression in the form $\Gamma \vdash_{\mathcal{C}} A$, where $\mathcal{C}$ is a constraint set, Γ is a multiset of formulas and A is a formula. Rules of inference for QBAL are in Figure 1. All rules except first order ones are the natural generalizations of BLL rules. First order rules are similar to the standard ones from predicate logic as a sequent calculus, with the additional complexity brought on by constraints. If π is a proof of QBAL, then $|\pi|$ is the number of rule instances in π .

2.3 QBAL and Second Order Logic

Second order intuitionistic logic can be presented as a context-independent sequence calculus with explicit structural rules [17], G2i. Rules of G2i are in Figure 2. There is a forgetful map $[\cdot]$ from the space of QBAL proofs to the space of G2i proofs. In particular $\multimap$ corresponds to $\rightarrow$ and $\otimes$ corresponds to $\wedge$. Essentially, $[\pi]$ have the same structure of π , except for exponential and first order rules, which have no formal correspondence in G2i. From our point of view, if $[\pi] = [\rho]$, then π and ρ correspond to the same *program*, i.e. QBAL can be seen as a proper decoration of second order logic proofs with additional information which are not necessary to perform the underlying computation.

2.4 Properties

QBAL inherits some nice properties from BLL. In particular, proofs can be manipulated in a uniform way by altering their conclusion without altering their structure, i.e., without changing

Axiom and Cut	
$\frac{A \sqsubseteq_{\mathcal{C}} B}{A \vdash_{\mathcal{C}} B} A$	$\frac{\Gamma \vdash_{\mathcal{C}} A \quad \Delta, A \vdash_{\mathcal{C}} B}{\Gamma, \Delta \vdash_{\mathcal{C}} B} U$
Structural Rules	
$\frac{\Gamma \vdash_{\mathcal{C}} B}{\Gamma, A \vdash_{\mathcal{C}} B} W$	$\frac{\Gamma, !_{x < p} A, !_{y < q} A\{p + y/x\} \vdash_{\mathcal{C}} B \quad p + q \sqsubseteq_{\mathcal{C}} r}{\Gamma, !_{x < r} A \vdash_{\mathcal{C}} B} X$
Multiplicative Logical Rules	
$\frac{\Gamma, A \vdash_{\mathcal{C}} B}{\Gamma \vdash_{\mathcal{C}} A \multimap B} R_{\multimap}$	$\frac{\Gamma \vdash_{\mathcal{C}} A \quad \Delta, B \vdash_{\mathcal{C}} C}{\Gamma, \Delta, A \multimap B \vdash_{\mathcal{C}} C} L_{\multimap}$
$\frac{\Gamma \vdash_{\mathcal{C}} A \quad \Delta \vdash_{\mathcal{C}} B}{\Gamma, \Delta \vdash_{\mathcal{C}} A \otimes B} R_{\otimes}$	$\frac{\Gamma, A, B \vdash_{\mathcal{C}} C}{\Gamma, A \otimes B \vdash_{\mathcal{C}} C} L_{\otimes}$
Exponential Rules	
$\frac{A_1, \dots, A_n \vdash_{\mathcal{C}} B \quad \mathcal{D}, x < p \models \mathcal{C} \quad x \notin FV(\mathcal{D}) \quad p \sqsubseteq_{\mathcal{D}} q_i}{!_{x < q_1} A_1, \dots, !_{x < q_n} A_n \vdash_{\mathcal{D}} !_{x < p} B} P!$	
$\frac{A\{1/x\}, \Gamma \vdash_{\mathcal{C}} B \quad 1 \sqsubseteq_{\mathcal{C}} p}{!_{x < p} A, \Gamma \vdash_{\mathcal{C}} B} D!$	
$\frac{!_{x < p} !_{z < q} A\{z + \sum_{w < x} q\{w/x\}/y\}, \Gamma \vdash_{\mathcal{C}} B \quad r \sqsubseteq_{\mathcal{C}} \sum_{x < p} q}{!_{y < r} A, \Gamma \vdash_{\mathcal{C}} B} N!$	
Second Order Rules	
$\frac{\Gamma \vdash_{\mathcal{C}} A \quad \alpha \notin FV(\Gamma)}{\Gamma \vdash_{\mathcal{C}} \forall \alpha. A} R_{\forall \alpha}$	$\frac{\Gamma, A\{B/\alpha(x_1, \dots, x_n)\} \vdash_{\mathcal{C}} C}{\Gamma, \forall \alpha. A \vdash_{\mathcal{C}} C} L_{\forall \alpha}$
First Order Rules	
$\frac{\Gamma \vdash_{\mathcal{C} \cup \mathcal{D}} A \quad \bar{x} \notin FV(\Gamma) \cup FV(\mathcal{C})}{\Gamma \vdash_{\mathcal{C}} \forall \bar{x} : \mathcal{D}. A} R_{\forall x}$	$\frac{\Gamma, A\{\bar{p}/\bar{x}\} \vdash_{\mathcal{C}} C \quad \mathcal{C} \models \mathcal{D}\{\bar{p}/\bar{x}\}}{\Gamma, \forall \bar{x} : \mathcal{D}. A \vdash_{\mathcal{C}} C} L_{\forall x}$
$\frac{\Gamma \vdash_{\mathcal{C}} A\{\bar{p}/\bar{x}\} \quad \mathcal{C} \models \mathcal{D}\{\bar{p}/\bar{x}\}}{\Gamma \vdash_{\mathcal{C}} \exists \bar{x} : \mathcal{D}. A} R_{\exists x}$	$\frac{\Gamma, A \vdash_{\mathcal{C} \cup \mathcal{D}} C \quad \bar{x} \notin FV(\Gamma) \cup FV(C) \cup FV(\mathcal{C})}{\Gamma, \exists \bar{x} : \mathcal{D} : A \vdash_{\mathcal{C}} C} L_{\exists x}$

Figure 1: A sequent calculus for QBAL

Axiom, Cut and Structural Rules			
$\frac{}{A \vdash A} A$	$\frac{\Gamma \vdash A \quad \Delta, A \vdash B}{\Gamma, \Delta \vdash B} U$	$\frac{\Gamma \vdash B}{\Gamma, A \vdash B} W$	$\frac{\Gamma, A, A \vdash}{\Gamma, A \vdash B} X$
Logical Rules			
$\frac{\Gamma, A \vdash B}{\Gamma \vdash A \rightarrow B} R_{\rightarrow}$	$\frac{\Gamma \vdash A \quad \Delta, B \vdash C}{\Gamma, \Delta, A \rightarrow B \vdash C} L_{\rightarrow}$	$\frac{\Gamma \vdash A \quad \Delta \vdash B}{\Gamma, \Delta \vdash A \times B} R_{\times}$	$\frac{\Gamma, A, B \vdash C}{\Gamma, A \times B \vdash C} L_{\times}$
Second Order Rules			
$\frac{\Gamma \vdash A \quad \alpha \notin FV(\Gamma)}{\Gamma \vdash \forall \alpha. A} R_{\forall}$	$\frac{\Gamma, A\{B/\alpha\} \vdash C}{\Gamma, \forall \alpha. A \vdash C} L_{\forall}$		

Figure 2: A sequent calculus for G2i

the underlying second order logic proof. First of all, a useful transformation is the strengthening of the underlying constraint set $\mathcal{C}$:

Proposition 2.1 *If $\pi : A_1, \dots, A_n \vdash_{\mathcal{C}} B$ is a proof and $\mathcal{D} \models \mathcal{C}$, then there is a proof $\rho : A_1, \dots, A_n \vdash_{\mathcal{D}} B$ such $[\rho] = [\pi]$ and $|\rho| \leq |\pi|$.*

Proof. An easy induction on π . □

Lemma 2.2 *If $x_1, \dots, x_n$ occur positively (negatively, respectively) in $\mathcal{C}$, $p_i \sqsubseteq_{\mathcal{D}} q_i$ for every i and $\bar{x} \notin FV(\mathcal{D})$, then $\mathcal{C}\{\bar{p}/\bar{x}\} \cup \mathcal{D} \models \mathcal{C}\{\bar{q}/\bar{x}\}$ ($\mathcal{C}\{\bar{q}/\bar{x}\} \cup \mathcal{D} \models \mathcal{C}\{\bar{p}/\bar{x}\}$, respectively).*

Proof. Take any constraint $r \leq t$ in $\mathcal{C}$ and suppose $x_1, \dots, x_n$ occur positively in $\mathcal{C}$. Then they occur positively in $r \leq t$ and they *cannot* occur in r . So:

$$\begin{aligned} (r \leq t)\{\bar{p}/\bar{x}\} &= r \leq (t\{\bar{p}/\bar{x}\}) \\ (r \leq t)\{\bar{q}/\bar{x}\} &= r \leq (t\{\bar{q}/\bar{x}\}) \end{aligned}$$

Now, since $p_i \sqsubseteq_{\mathcal{D}} q_i$ for every i , $t\{\bar{p}/\bar{x}\} \sqsubseteq_{\mathcal{D}} t\{\bar{q}/\bar{x}\}$. As a consequence, $\mathcal{C}\{\bar{p}/\bar{x}\} \cup \mathcal{D} \models \mathcal{C}\{\bar{q}/\bar{x}\}$. Analogously if $x_1, \dots, x_n$ occur only negatively in $\mathcal{C}$. □

Lemma 2.3 *If A is a formula where the variables $x_1, \dots, x_n$ occur only positively (negatively, respectively) $p_i \sqsubseteq_{\mathcal{C}} q_i$ for every i and $\bar{x} \notin FV(\mathcal{C})$, then $A\{\bar{p}/\bar{x}\} \sqsubseteq_{\mathcal{C}} A\{\bar{q}/\bar{x}\}$ ($A\{\bar{q}/\bar{x}\} \sqsubseteq_{\mathcal{C}} A\{\bar{p}/\bar{x}\}$, respectively).*

Proof. By induction on A . Let's just check the most interesting cases:

- If $A = \exists \bar{y} : \mathcal{D}.B$, then the variables in $\bar{y}$ can be assumed to be distinct from $x_1, \dots, x_n$. Moreover:

$$\begin{aligned} A\{\bar{p}/\bar{x}\} &= \exists \bar{y} : \mathcal{D}\{\bar{p}/\bar{x}\}.B\{\bar{p}/\bar{x}\} \\ A\{\bar{q}/\bar{x}\} &= \exists \bar{y} : \mathcal{D}\{\bar{q}/\bar{x}\}.B\{\bar{q}/\bar{x}\} \end{aligned}$$

Now, suppose that $x_1, \dots, x_n$ occur only positively in A . Then, by induction hypothesis, $B\{\bar{p}/\bar{x}\} \sqsubseteq_{\mathcal{C}} B\{\bar{q}/\bar{x}\}$. Moreover, by Lemma 2.2, $\mathcal{D}\{\bar{p}/\bar{x}\} \cup \mathcal{C} \models \mathcal{D}\{\bar{q}/\bar{x}\}$. By definition, this implies $A\{\bar{p}/\bar{x}\} \sqsubseteq_{\mathcal{C}} A\{\bar{q}/\bar{x}\}$. Similarly if $x_1, \dots, x_n$ occur only negatively in A .

- If $A = \exists \bar{y} : \mathcal{D}.B$, then we can proceed exactly in the same way.

This concludes the proof. □

QBAL is monotone with respect to the relation $\sqsubseteq \mathcal{C}$ on formulas:

Proposition 2.2 *If $\pi : A_1, \dots, A_n \vdash_{\mathcal{C}} B$, $B \sqsubseteq_{\mathcal{C}} D$ and $C_i \sqsubseteq_{\mathcal{C}} A_i$ for every $1 \leq i \leq n$, then there is $\rho : C_1, \dots, C_n \vdash_{\mathcal{C}} D$ such that $[\rho] = [\pi]$.*

Proof. By induction on $|\pi|$ Some interesting cases are the following ones:

- Suppose that π is simply

$$\frac{A \sqsubseteq_{\mathcal{C}} B}{A \vdash_{\mathcal{C}} B} .$$

and that $C \sqsubseteq_{\mathcal{C}} A$ and $B \sqsubseteq_{\mathcal{C}} D$. Then, by transitivity of $\sqsubseteq_{\mathcal{C}}$, $C \sqsubseteq_{\mathcal{C}} D$ and ρ is

$$\frac{C \sqsubseteq_{\mathcal{C}} D}{C \vdash_{\mathcal{C}} D} .$$

- Suppose that π is

$$\frac{A_1, \dots, A_n \vdash_{\mathcal{C}} B \quad \mathcal{D}, x < p \models \mathcal{C} \quad x \notin FV(\mathcal{D}) \quad p \sqsubseteq_{\mathcal{D}} q_i}{!_{x < q_1} A_1, \dots, !_{x < q_n} A_n \vdash_{\mathcal{D}} !_{x < p} B}$$

and that $!_{x < r_i} C_i \sqsubseteq_{\mathcal{D}} !_{x < q_i} A_i$ (for every i) and $!_{x < p} B \sqsubseteq_{\mathcal{D}} !_{x < s} D$. By definition, $q_i \sqsubseteq_{\mathcal{D}} r_i$ for every i and $s \sqsubseteq_{\mathcal{D}} p$. By the side condition to the premise of π (and by transitivity of $\sqsubseteq_{\mathcal{D}}$), we obtain $s \sqsubseteq_{\mathcal{D}} r_i$ for every i . Moreover, we have $C_i \sqsubseteq_{\mathcal{D} \cup \{x < q_i\}} A_i$ for every i and $B \sqsubseteq_{\mathcal{D} \cup \{x < s\}} D$. This implies $C_i \sqsubseteq_{\mathcal{D} \cup \{x < s\}} A_i$ for every i . Now, since $\mathcal{D} \cup \{x < s\} \models \mathcal{D} \cup \{x < p\} \models \mathcal{C}$, we can obtain, by Proposition 2.1, a proof σ of $A_1, \dots, A_n \vdash_{\mathcal{D} \cup \{x < s\}} B$ such that $|\sigma| < |\pi|$. Then, we can easily apply the induction hypothesis on σ and conclude.

This concludes the proof. $\square$

Another useful transformation on proofs is the substitution of resource polynomials for free variables:

Proposition 2.3 *If $\pi : A_1, \dots, A_n \vdash_{\mathcal{C}} B$ is a proof and $p_1, \dots, p_n$ are resource polynomials free for substitution for the free resource variables $x_1, \dots, x_n$ in π , then there is a proof $\pi\{\bar{p}/\bar{x}\} : A_1\{\bar{p}/\bar{x}\}, \dots, A_n\{\bar{p}/\bar{x}\} \vdash_{\mathcal{C}\{\bar{p}/\bar{x}\}} B\{\bar{p}/\bar{x}\}$ such that $[\pi\{\bar{p}/\bar{x}\}] = [\pi]$.*

Proof. By induction on π . Some interesting cases are the following ones:

- Suppose that π is simply

$$\frac{A \sqsubseteq_{\mathcal{C}} B}{A \vdash_{\mathcal{C}} B} .$$

Now, if $A \sqsubseteq_{\mathcal{C}} B$ then $A\{\bar{p}/\bar{x}\} \sqsubseteq_{\mathcal{C}\{\bar{p}/\bar{x}\}} B\{\bar{p}/\bar{x}\}$, as can be easily proved by induction on A . As a consequence,

$$\frac{A\{\bar{p}/\bar{x}\} \sqsubseteq_{\mathcal{C}\{\bar{p}/\bar{x}\}} B\{\bar{p}/\bar{x}\}}{A\{\bar{p}/\bar{x}\} \vdash_{\mathcal{C}\{\bar{p}/\bar{x}\}} B\{\bar{p}/\bar{x}\}} .$$

This concludes the proof. $\square$

But formulas themselves can be substituted (for atoms) into a proof:

Proposition 2.4 *If $\pi : A_1, \dots, A_n \vdash_{\mathcal{C}} B$ is a proof, C is a formula where the free variables $x_1, \dots, x_m$ occur only positively and α is an atom with arity m , then there is a proof $\pi\{C/\alpha\} : A_1\{C/\alpha\}, \dots, A_n\{C/\alpha\} \vdash_{\mathcal{C}} B\{C/\alpha\}$ such that $[\pi\{C/\alpha\}] = [\pi]$.*

Proof. By induction on π . Some interesting cases are the following ones:

- Again, one interesting case is when π is simply

$$\frac{A \sqsubseteq_{\mathcal{C}} B}{A \vdash_{\mathcal{C}} B} .$$

Now, if $A \sqsubseteq_{\mathcal{C}} B$ then $A\{C/\alpha\} \sqsubseteq_{\mathcal{C}} B\{C/\alpha\}$, as can be easily proved by induction on A . As a consequence:

$$\frac{A\{\bar{p}/\bar{x}\} \sqsubseteq_{\text{consetone}\{\bar{p}/\bar{x}\}} B\{\bar{p}/\bar{x}\}}{A\{\bar{p}/\bar{x}\} \vdash_{\mathcal{C}\{\bar{p}/\bar{x}\}} B\{\bar{p}/\bar{x}\}} .$$

$\square$

2.5 Cut-Elimination

A nice application of the propositions we have just given is cut-elimination. Indeed, the new rules $R_{\forall x}$, $L_{\forall x}$, $R_{\exists x}$ and $L_{\exists x}$ do not cause any problem in the cut-elimination process. For example, the cut

$$\frac{\frac{\pi : \Gamma \vdash_{\mathcal{C} \cup \mathcal{D}} A \quad \bar{x} \notin FV(\Gamma) \cup FV(\mathcal{C})}{\Gamma \vdash_{\mathcal{C}} \forall \bar{x} : \mathcal{D}. A} R_{\forall x} \quad \frac{\Delta, A\{\bar{p}/\bar{x}\} \vdash_{\mathcal{C}} C \quad \mathcal{C} \models \mathcal{D}\{\bar{p}/\bar{x}\}}{\Delta, \forall \bar{x} : \mathcal{D}. A \vdash_{\mathcal{C}} C} L_{\forall x}}{\Gamma, \Delta \vdash_{\mathcal{C}} C} U$$

can be eliminated as follows:

$$\frac{\sigma : \Gamma \vdash_{\mathcal{C}} A\{\bar{p}/\bar{x}\} \quad \rho : \Delta, A\{\bar{p}/\bar{x}\} \vdash_{\mathcal{C}} C}{\Gamma, \Delta \vdash_{\mathcal{C}} C} U$$

where σ is obtained by applying Proposition 2.1 to

$$\pi\{\bar{p}/\bar{x}\} : \Gamma \vdash_{\mathcal{C} \cup \mathcal{D}\{\bar{p}/\bar{x}\}} A\{\bar{p}/\bar{x}\},$$

itself obtained from π applying Proposition 2.3. In this paper, we will not study cut-elimination. And polynomial time soundness will be itself proved semantically.

2.6 Programming in QBAL

The Curry-Howard correspondence allows to use BLL and QBAL as programming languages. In particular, following the usual impredicative encoding of data into second order intuitionistic logic, natural numbers can be represented as cut-free proofs of the formula

$$\mathbf{N}_p = \forall \alpha. !_{y < p}(\alpha(y) \multimap \alpha(y+1)) \multimap \alpha(0) \multimap \alpha(p).$$

However, only natural numbers less or equal to p can be represented.

This can be generalized to any word algebra. Given a word algebra $\mathbb{W}$, we will denote by $\varepsilon_{\mathbb{W}}$ the only 0-ary constructor of $\mathbb{W}$ and by $c_{\mathbb{W}}^1, \dots, c_{\mathbb{W}}^w$ the 1-ary constructors of the same algebra. Notice that these objects can be thought of both as term formers and as (0-ary or unary) functions on terms. Terms of a free algebra $\mathbb{W}$ of length at most p can be represented as cut-free proofs of the formula

$$\mathbf{W}_p = \underbrace{\forall \alpha. !_{y < p}(\alpha(y) \multimap \alpha(y+1)) \multimap \dots \multimap !_{y < p}(\alpha(y) \multimap \alpha(y+1)) \multimap \alpha(0) \multimap \alpha(p)}_{w \text{ times}}.$$

Functions on natural numbers can be represented by proofs with conclusion $\mathbf{N}_x \vdash \mathbf{N}_p$, where p is a resource polynomial depending on x , only. More generally, functions on the word algebra $\mathbb{W}$ can be represented by proofs with conclusion $\mathbf{W}_x \vdash \mathbf{W}_p$. For example, all constructors $c_{\mathbb{W}}^1, \dots, c_{\mathbb{W}}^w$ corresponds to proofs with conclusion $\mathbf{W}_x \vdash \mathbf{W}_{x+1}$. More generally, the polynomial p gives a bound on the size of the result, as a function of the size of the input. QBAL supports iteration on any word algebra (including natural numbers). As an example, for every p and for every A where x only appears positively, there is a proof π_p^A of $\mathbf{N}_p, A\{y/x\} \multimap A\{y+1/x\}, A\{0/x\} \vdash A\{p/x\}$.

2.7 Unbounded First Order Quantification is Unsound

One may wonder why quantification on numerical variables is restricted to be bounded (see Definition 2.3). The reason is very simple: in presence of unbounded quantification, QBAL would immediately become unsound. To see that, define $\mathbf{N}_{\infty}$ to be the formula $\exists(x) : \emptyset. \mathbf{N}_x$. The composition of the successor with itself yields a proof with conclusion $\mathbf{N}_x \vdash \mathbf{N}_{x+2}$ which, by rules $R_{\exists x}$ and $L_{\exists x}$, becomes a proof with conclusion $\mathbf{N}_{\infty} \vdash \mathbf{N}_{\infty}$. Iterating it, we obtain a proof of $\mathbf{N}_x \vdash \mathbf{N}_{\infty}$ which computes the function $n \mapsto 2n$. But by rule $L_{\exists x}$, it can be turned into a proof of $\mathbf{N}_{\infty} \vdash \mathbf{N}_{\infty}$, and iterating it again we obtain a proof computing the exponential function. The boundedness assumption will be indeed critical in Section 4, where we establish that any functions which is representable in QBAL is polynomial time computable.

3 Set-Theoretic Semantics

In this Section, we give a set-theoretic semantics for QBAL. We assume that our ambient set-theory is constructive. This way we have a set of sets $\mathcal{U}$ which contains the natural numbers, closed under binary products, function spaces and $\mathcal{U}$ -indexed products. An alternative to assuming a constructive ambient set theory consists of replacing plain sets with PERs (partial equivalence relations) or domains or similar structures. See [10] for a more detailed discussion of this issue.

Formulas of QBAL can be interpreted as sets as follows, where ρ is an environment mapping atoms to sets:

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket \alpha(\overline{p}) \rrbracket_\rho &= \rho(\alpha); \\ \llbracket A \otimes B \rrbracket_\rho &= \llbracket A \rrbracket_\rho \times \llbracket B \rrbracket_\rho; \\ \llbracket A \rightarrow B \rrbracket_\rho &= \llbracket A \rrbracket_\rho \Rightarrow \llbracket B \rrbracket_\rho; \\ \llbracket \forall \alpha. A \rrbracket_\rho &= \prod_{C \in \mathcal{U}} \llbracket A \rrbracket_{\rho[\alpha \mapsto C]}; \\ \llbracket !_{x < p} A \rrbracket_\rho &= \llbracket \forall \overline{x} : \mathcal{C}. A \rrbracket_\rho = \llbracket \exists \overline{x} : \mathcal{C}. A \rrbracket_\rho = \llbracket A \rrbracket_\rho. \end{aligned}$$

Please observe that the interpretation of any formula A is completely independent from the resource polynomials appearing in A .

To any QBAL proof π of $A_1, \dots, A_n \vdash_{\mathcal{C}} B$ we can associate a set-theoretic function $\llbracket \pi \rrbracket_\rho : \llbracket A_1 \otimes \dots \otimes A_n \rrbracket_\rho \rightarrow \llbracket B \rrbracket_\rho$ by induction on π , in the obvious way. $\llbracket \pi \rrbracket_\rho$ is equal to the set-theoretic semantics of $[\pi]$ as a proof of second order intuitionistic logic. Set-theoretic semantics of proofs is preserved by cut-elimination: if π reduces to σ by cut-elimination, then $\llbracket \pi \rrbracket_\rho = \llbracket \sigma \rrbracket_\rho$.

Observe that $\llbracket A \rrbracket_\rho$ only depends on the values of ρ on atoms appearing free in A . So, in particular,

$$\llbracket \mathbf{N}_q \rrbracket_\rho = \prod_{C \in \mathcal{U}} (C \Rightarrow C) \Rightarrow (C \Rightarrow C)$$

is independent on ρ and on q , since $\mathbf{N}_q$ is a closed formula. Similarly for $\llbracket \mathbf{W}_q \rrbracket_\rho$. Actually, there are functions $\varphi_{\mathbb{N}} : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \llbracket \mathbf{N}_p \rrbracket$ and $\psi_{\mathbb{N}} : \llbracket \mathbf{N}_p \rrbracket \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ such that $\psi_{\mathbb{N}} \circ \varphi_{\mathbb{N}}$ is the identity on natural numbers. They are defined as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} (\varphi_{\mathbb{N}}(n))_C(f, z) &= f^n(z) \\ \psi_{\mathbb{N}}(x) &= x_{\mathbb{N}}(x \mapsto x + 1)(0) \end{aligned}$$

So, given a proof $\pi : \mathbf{N}_x \vdash \mathbf{N}_p$, the numeric function represented by π is simply $\psi_{\mathbb{N}} \circ \llbracket \pi \rrbracket \circ \varphi_{\mathbb{N}}$. Similar arguments hold for functions with conclusion $\mathbf{W}_x \vdash \mathbf{W}_p$.

4 QBAL and Polynomial Time

In this Section we show that all functions on natural numbers definable in QBAL are polynomial time computable. To this end, we follow the semantic approach in [10] which we now summarise.

4.1 Realisability Sets

Let X be a finite set of variables. We write $\mathcal{V}(X)$ for $\mathbb{N}^X$ —the elements of $\mathcal{V}(X)$ are called *valuations* (over X). If $\eta \in \mathcal{V}(X)$ and $c \in \mathbb{N}$ then $\eta[x \mapsto c]$ denotes the valuation which maps x to c and acts like η otherwise. We assume some reasonable encoding of valuations as natural numbers allowing them to be passed as arguments to algorithms.

If $\mathcal{C}$ is a constraint set involving at most the variables in X (over X) then we write $\eta \models \mathcal{C}$ to mean that the valuation $\eta \in \mathcal{V}(X)$ satisfies all the constraints in $\mathcal{C}$. We write $\mathcal{P}(X)$ for the set of resource polynomials over X . If $p \in \mathcal{P}(X)$ and $\eta \in \mathcal{V}(X)$ we write $p(\eta)$ for the number obtained by evaluating p with $x \mapsto \eta(x)$ for each $x \in X$.

We assume known the untyped lambda calculus as defined e.g. in [2]. An untyped lambda term is *affine linear* if each variable (free or bound) appears at most once (up to α -congruence). For example, $\lambda x.\lambda y.yx$ and $\lambda x.\lambda y.y$ and $\lambda x.xy$ are affine linear while the term $\lambda x.xx$ is not. Notice that every affine linear term t is strongly normalisable in less than $|t|$ steps where $|t|$ is the size of the term. The runtime of the computation leading to the normal form is therefore $O(|t|^2)$. We will henceforth use the expression *affine lambda term* for an untyped affine linear lambda term which is in normal form. If s, t are affine lambda terms then their application st is defined as the normal form of the lambda term st . Notice that the application st can be computed in time $O((|s| + |t|)^2)$.

If s, t are affine lambda terms we write $s \otimes t$ for the affine lambda term $\lambda f.fst$. If t is an affine lambda term possibly containing the free variables x, y then we write $\lambda x \otimes y.t$ for $\lambda u.u(\lambda x \lambda y.t)$. Notice that $(\lambda x \otimes y.t)(u \otimes v) = t\{u/x, v/y\}$.

More generally, if $(t_i)_{i < n}$ is a family of affine lambda terms, we write $\bigotimes_{i < n} t_i$ for $\lambda f.ft_0t_1 \dots t_{n-1}$ and $\lambda \bigotimes_{i < n} x_i.t$ for $\lambda u.u(\lambda x_0 \lambda x_1 \dots \lambda x_{n-1}.t)$. Again,

$$(\lambda \bigotimes_{i < n} x_i.t)(\bigotimes_{i < n} t_i) = t\{t_0/x_0, \dots, t_{n-1}/x_{n-1}\}$$

We write Λ_a for the set of closed affine lambda terms.

There is a canonical way of representing terms of any word algebra $\mathbb{W}$ as affine lambda terms, which is attributed to Dana Scott [18]. For example, the natural number 2 corresponds to the term $\ulcorner 2 \urcorner = \lambda x.\lambda y.x(\lambda x.\lambda y.x(\lambda x.\lambda y.y))$.

Definition 4.1 *Let X be a finite set of resource variables. A realizability set over X is a pair $A = (|A|, \Vdash_A)$ where $|A|$ is a set and $\Vdash_A \subseteq \mathcal{V}(X) \times \Lambda_a \times |A|$ is a ternary relation between valuations over X , affine lambda terms, and the set $|A|$. We write $\eta, t \Vdash_A a$ for $(\eta, t, a) \in \Vdash_A$.*

The intuition behind $\eta, t \Vdash_A a$ is that a is an abstract semantic value, η measures the abstract size of a , and the affine lambda term t encodes the abstract value a .

Example 4.1 (i) *The realizability set $\mathbf{N}_x$ over $\{x\}$ of tally natural numbers (“of size at most x ”) is defined by: $|\mathbf{N}_x| = \mathbb{N}$ and*

$$\eta, t \Vdash_{\mathbf{N}_x} n \text{ if } t = \ulcorner n \urcorner \text{ and } \eta(x) \geq n$$

(ii) *The realizability set $\mathbf{W}_x$ over $\{x\}$ of free terms of $\mathbb{W}$ (“of length at most x ”) is defined by: $|\mathbf{W}_x| = \mathbb{W}$ and*

$$\eta, t \Vdash_{\mathbf{W}_x} w \text{ if } t = \ulcorner w \urcorner \text{ and } \eta(x) \geq |w|$$

These realizability sets $\mathbf{N}_x$ and $\mathbf{W}_x$ turn out to be retracts of the denotations of the BLL formulas from Section 2.6.

Definition 4.2 *Let A be a realizability set over X . We say that $x \in X$ is positive (negative, respectively) in A , if for all $\eta, \mu \in \mathcal{V}(X), t \in \Lambda_a, a \in |A|$ where η and μ agree on $X \setminus \{x\}$ and $\eta(x) \leq \mu(x)$ ($\eta(x) \geq \mu(x)$, respectively), $\eta, t \Vdash_A a$ implies $\mu, t \Vdash_A a$.*

We notice that x is positive in $\mathbf{N}_x$ and $\mathbf{W}_x$.

Definition 4.3 *Let A, B be realizability sets over some set X . A morphism from A to B is a function $f : |A| \rightarrow |B|$ satisfying the following condition: there exists a function $e : \mathcal{V}(X) \rightarrow \Lambda_a$ such that $e(\eta)$ is computable in time $q(\eta)$ for some resource polynomial q and for each $\eta \in \mathcal{V}(X), t \in \Lambda_a, a \in |A|$, we have*

$$\eta, t \Vdash_A a \text{ implies } \eta, e(\eta)t \Vdash_B f(a)$$

In this case we say that e witnesses f and write $A \xrightarrow{f}_e B$ where in the notation the algorithm e is presumed to exist.

The following definition summarises the interpretation of formulas according to [10]:

Definition 4.4 Let A, B be realizability sets over X . Then the following are realizability sets over X :

- $A \otimes B$ as given by $|A \otimes B| = |A| \times |B|$ and $\eta, t \Vdash_{A \otimes B} (a, b)$ iff $t = u \otimes v$, where $\eta, u \Vdash_A a$ and $\eta, v \Vdash_B b$.
- $A \multimap B$ is given by $|A \multimap B| = |A| \Rightarrow |B|$ and $\eta, t \Vdash_{A \multimap B} f$ iff whenever $\eta, u \Vdash_A a$ it holds that $\eta, t u \Vdash_B f(a)$.

If C is a realizability set over $X \cup \{x\}$ and $p \in \mathcal{P}(X)$ then a realizability set $!_{x < p} C$ over X is defined by $!_{x < p} C = |C|$ and $\eta, t \Vdash_{!_{x < p} C} a$ if

- $t = \bigotimes_{i < p(\eta)} t_i$ for some family $(t_i)_{i < p(\eta)}$;
- $\eta[x \mapsto i], t_i \Vdash_C a$ for each $i < p(\eta)$.

We refer to [10] for the in principle straightforward but notationally cumbersome account of universal quantification over propositions.

Using these semantic constructions one defines for each formula A with free resource variables contained in X and assignment ρ of realizability sets to atoms, a realizability set $\llbracket A \rrbracket_\rho^\mathcal{B}$ over X in such a way that $\llbracket A \rrbracket_\rho^\mathcal{B} = \llbracket A \rrbracket_{|\rho|}$ (where $|\rho|$ is the assignment of sets to atoms obtained from ρ in the obvious way), that is to say, the underlying set of the realizability set interpreting a formula A coincides with the set-theoretic meaning of A .

The main result of [10] then asserts that if π is a proof (in BLL) of a sequent $\Gamma \vdash B$ then the function $\llbracket \pi \rrbracket_{|\rho|}$ is a morphism from $\llbracket \Gamma \rrbracket_\rho^\mathcal{B}$ to $\llbracket B \rrbracket_\rho^\mathcal{B}$ (where we interpret a context Γ as a $\otimes$ -product over its components as usual). From this, polynomial time soundness is a direct corollary since polynomial time computability is built into the notion of a morphism.

It thus only remains to extend the realizability model to cover the constructs of QBAL which we do in the next Section.

4.2 Extending the Realizability Model to QBAL

The notion of a realizability set above is adequate to model formulas of QBAL. The notion of a morphism, however, should be slightly generalized in order to capture constraints:

Definition 4.5 Let A, B be realizability sets over some set X and $\mathcal{C}$ a constraint set over X . A function $f : |A| \rightarrow |B|$ is a $\mathcal{C}$ -morphism from A to B iff there exists a function $e : \mathcal{V}(X) \rightarrow \Lambda_a$ such that $e(\eta)$ is computable in time $q(\eta)$ for some resource polynomial q and for each $\eta \in \mathcal{V}(X)$ with $\eta \models \mathcal{C}$, $t \in \Lambda_a$, $a \in |A|$, we have that $\eta, t \Vdash_A a$ implies $\eta, e(\eta)t \Vdash_B f(a)$.

In order to define realizability sets $\forall \bar{y} : \mathcal{C}. A$ and $\exists \bar{y} : \mathcal{C}. A$, we fix some encoding of environments η as affine lambda terms using the $\ulcorner \cdot \urcorner$ encoding of natural numbers. We do not notationally distinguish environments from their encodings.

Definition 4.6 Let X, Y be disjoint sets of variables. Let A be a realizability set over $X \cup Y$ and $\mathcal{C}$ a constraint set over $X \cup Y$ where we put $Y = \{y_1, \dots, y_n\}$ and $\bar{y} = (y_1, \dots, y_n)$. Furthermore, for each $i = 1, \dots, n$ let $p_i \in \mathcal{P}(X)$ be such that $\mathcal{C} \models \{\bar{y} \leq \bar{p}\}$.

- $|\forall \bar{y} : \mathcal{C}. A| = |\exists \bar{y} : \mathcal{C}. A| = |A|$,
- $\eta, t \Vdash_{\forall \bar{y} : \mathcal{C}. A} a \iff \forall \mu \in \mathcal{V}(Y). \eta \cup \mu \models \mathcal{C} \Rightarrow \eta \cup \mu, t \Vdash_A a$.
- $\eta, \mu \otimes t \Vdash_{\exists \bar{y} : \mathcal{C}. A} a \iff \mu \in \mathcal{V}(Y) \wedge \eta \cup \mu \models \mathcal{C} \wedge \eta \cup \mu, t \Vdash_A a$

Recall that $\forall \bar{y} : \mathcal{C}. A$ and $\exists \bar{y} : \mathcal{C}. A$ are well-formed only if for each i there is a resource polynomial p_i such that $\mathcal{C} \models y_i < p_i$. Therefore, the set $\{\mu \mid \eta \cup \mu \models \mathcal{C}\}$ is finite and in fact computable in polynomial time from η .

We are now able to prove the main result of this Section:

Theorem 4.1 Let π be a proof of a sequent $\Gamma \vdash_{\mathcal{C}} B$ and ρ a mapping of atoms to realizability sets. Then $\llbracket \pi \rrbracket_{|\rho|}$ is a $\mathcal{C}$ -morphism from $\llbracket \Gamma \rrbracket_\rho^\mathcal{B}$ to $\llbracket B \rrbracket_\rho^\mathcal{B}$.

Proof. The proof is by induction on derivations. We only show the cases that differ significantly from the development in [10].

Case P₁. For simplicity, suppose that $n = 1$, $q_1 = p$ and $A_1 = A$. The induction hypothesis shows that $\llbracket \pi \rrbracket_{|\rho|}$ is a $\mathcal{C}$ -morphism from $\llbracket A \rrbracket_\rho^\mathcal{B}$ to $\llbracket B \rrbracket_\rho^\mathcal{B}$ witnessed by e . As in the proof of the main result in [10], we define

$$d(\eta) = \lambda \bigotimes_{i < p(\eta)} x_i. \bigotimes_{i < p(\eta)} e(\eta[x \mapsto i])x_i.$$

Now, if $\eta \models \mathcal{D}$, then $\eta[x \mapsto i] \models \mathcal{C}$ whenever $i < p(\eta)$ by the side condition from rule P_1 . We obtain that $\llbracket \pi \rrbracket$ is a $\mathcal{D}$ -morphism from $\llbracket !_{x < p} A \rrbracket_\rho^\mathcal{B}$ to $\llbracket !_{x < p} B \rrbracket_\rho^\mathcal{B}$ witnessed by d .

The remaining cases are the four rules for first order quantifiers. In each case, we assume by the induction hypothesis that $\llbracket \pi \rrbracket$ is a morphism realising the premise of the rule and let e be its witness. We have to show that $\llbracket \pi \rrbracket$ is a morphism realising the conclusion of the rule. Note that the set-theoretic meaning of a proof does not change upon application of any of the quantifier rules.

Case $R_{\forall x}$. Suppose that $\eta \models \mathcal{C}$ and $\eta, t_\gamma \Vdash \llbracket \Gamma \rrbracket_\rho^\mathcal{B} \gamma$. Now suppose $\eta \cup \mu \models \mathcal{D}$. By the induction hypothesis $\eta \cup \mu, e(\eta \cup \mu)t_\gamma \Vdash \llbracket A \rrbracket_\rho^\mathcal{B} \llbracket \pi \rrbracket(\gamma)$. We thus define d by $d(\eta) = u$ where $u \in \Lambda_a$ is such that $ut\mu = e(\eta \cup \mu)t$ whenever $\eta \cup \mu \models \mathcal{C}$. Recall that for a given η there are only $q(\eta)$ such μ (for a fixed resource polynomial q), so that t can be construed as a big case distinction over all those μ . It is then clear that d is polynomial time computable and realises the conclusion of the rule.

Case $L_{\forall x}$. Assume $\eta \models \mathcal{C}$ and $\eta, t_\gamma \Vdash \llbracket \Gamma \rrbracket_\rho^\mathcal{B} \gamma$ and $\eta, t_a \Vdash \llbracket \forall \bar{x} : \mathcal{D}. A \rrbracket_\rho^\mathcal{B} a$. Define $\mu_\eta \in \mathcal{V}(X)$ by $\mu_\eta(x_i) = p_i(\eta)$ so that $\eta \cup \mu_\eta \models \mathcal{D}$ by the side condition to the rule. Now, $\eta \cup \mu_\eta, t_a \mu_\eta \Vdash_A a$ by Definition 4.6. Hence, $\eta, t_a \mu_\eta \Vdash_{A\{\bar{p}/\bar{x}\}} a$. By the induction hypothesis, $e(\eta)(t_\gamma \otimes t_a \mu_\eta) \Vdash_C \llbracket \pi \rrbracket(\gamma, a)$, so $d(\eta) = \lambda x_\gamma \otimes x_a. e(\eta)(x_\gamma \otimes x_a(\mu_\eta))$ does the job. The remaining two cases are essentially dual to the previous two. We merely define the witnesses.

Case $R_{\exists x}$. Define $\mu(\eta)$ as in $L_{\forall x}$. We can then put $d(\eta) = \lambda t_\gamma. \mu(\eta) \otimes e(\eta)t_\gamma$.

Case $L_{\exists x}$. We define $d(\eta)$ to be such that $d(\eta)t_\gamma(\mu \otimes t) = e(\eta \cup \mu)t_\gamma t$. This is possible by hard-wiring separate cases for each of the polynomially in η many μ like in case $R_{\forall x}$. $\square$

5 On Compositional Embeddings

In this Section, we try to justify our emphasis on compositional embeddings. An embedding of a logical system or programming language $\mathbf{L}$ into QBAL is a function $\langle \cdot \rangle$ from the space of proofs (or programs) of $\mathbf{L}$ into the space of proofs for QBAL. Clearly, for an embedding to be relevant from a computational point of view, any proof π of $\mathbf{L}$ should be mapped to an equivalent proof $\langle \pi \rangle$, e.g., $\llbracket \langle \pi \rangle \rrbracket = \llbracket \pi \rrbracket$. The existence of an embedding of $\mathbf{L}$ into QBAL implicitly proves that QBAL is *extensionally* at least as powerful as $\mathbf{L}$. Such an embedding $\langle \cdot \rangle$ is not necessarily computable nor natural. But whenever $\mathbf{L}$ is a sound and complete ICC characterization of polynomial time, it must exist, since the classes of definable functions in $\mathbf{L}$ and in QBAL are exactly the same. Indeed, QBAL is both extensionally sound (see Section 4) and extensionally complete (since BLL can be compositionally embedded into it, see below).

Typically, one would like to go beyond extensionality and prove that QBAL is *intensionally* as powerful as $\mathbf{L}$. And if this is the goal, $\langle \cdot \rangle$ should be easily computable. Ideally, we would like $\langle \cdot \rangle$ to act homeomorphically on the space of proofs of $\mathbf{L}$. In other words, whenever a proof π of $\mathbf{L}$ is obtained applying a proof-forming rule R to $\rho_1, \dots, \rho_n$, then $\langle \pi \rangle$ should be obtainable from $\langle \rho_1 \rangle, \dots, \langle \rho_n \rangle$ in a uniform way, i.e., dependently on R but independently on $\langle \rho_1 \rangle, \dots, \langle \rho_n \rangle$. An embedding satisfying the above constraint is said to be *strongly compositional*. The embeddings we will present in the following two sections are only *weakly* compositional: $\llbracket \langle \pi \rangle \rrbracket$ can be uniformly built from $\llbracket \langle \rho_1 \rangle \rrbracket, \dots, \llbracket \langle \rho_n \rangle \rrbracket$ whenever π is obtained applying R to $\rho_1, \dots, \rho_n$. We believe that the existence of a weakly compositional embedding of $\mathbf{L}$ into QBAL is sufficient to guarantee that QBAL is intensionally as powerful as $\mathbf{L}$ because, as we pointed out in Section 2.3, $\llbracket \pi \rrbracket$ can be thought as the program hidden in the proof π .

Notice that BLL can be embedded into QBAL: for every BLL proof $\pi : \Gamma \vdash A$, there is a QBAL proof $\langle \pi \rangle : \Gamma \vdash_\emptyset A$ such that $\llbracket \pi \rrbracket = \llbracket \langle \pi \rangle \rrbracket$. Moreover, the embedding is strongly compositional.

6 Embedding LFPL

LFPL is a calculus for non-size-increasing computation introduced by the second author [9]. It allows to capture natural algorithms computing functions such that the size of the result is smaller or equal to the size of the arguments. This way, polynomial soundness is guaranteed despite the possibility of arbitrarily nested recursive definitions.

We here show that a core subset of LFPL can be compositionally embedded into QBAL. LFPL types are generated by the following grammar:

$$A ::= \diamond \mid \mathbf{N} \mid A \otimes A \mid A \multimap A.$$

Rules for LFPL in natural-deduction style are in Figure 3. We omit terms, since the computational content of type derivations is implicit in their skeleton. The set-theoretic semantics $\llbracket A \rrbracket$ of an LFPL

Axiom, Base Types and Weakening			
$\frac{}{A \vdash A} A$	$\frac{}{\mathbf{N}, \diamond \vdash \mathbf{N}} S$	$\frac{\diamond \vdash A \multimap A \quad \vdash A}{\vdash \mathbf{N} \multimap A} T$	$\frac{\Gamma \vdash A}{\Gamma, B \vdash A} W$
Multiplicative Rules			
$\frac{\Gamma, A \vdash B}{\Gamma \vdash A \multimap B} I_{\multimap}$		$\frac{\Gamma \vdash A \multimap B \quad \Delta \vdash A}{\Gamma, \Delta \vdash B} E_{\multimap}$	
$\frac{\Gamma \vdash A \quad \Delta \vdash B}{\Gamma, \Delta \vdash A \otimes B} I_{\otimes}$		$\frac{\Gamma \vdash A \otimes B \quad \Delta, A, B \vdash C}{\Gamma, \Delta \vdash C} E_{\otimes}$	

Figure 3: LFPL

formula A can be defined very easily: $\llbracket \diamond \rrbracket = \prod_{C \in \mathcal{U}} C \Rightarrow C$, $\llbracket \mathbf{N} \rrbracket = \prod_{C \in \mathcal{U}} (C \Rightarrow C) \Rightarrow (C \Rightarrow C)$, while the operators $\otimes$ and $\multimap$ are interpreted as usual. Notice that the interpretation of an LFPL formula does not depend on any environment ρ . This way, any LFPL proof $\pi : A_1, \dots, A_n \vdash B$ can be given a semantics $\llbracket \pi \rrbracket : \llbracket A_1 \otimes \dots \otimes A_n \rrbracket \rightarrow \llbracket B \rrbracket$, itself independent on any ρ .

LFPL types can be translated to QBAL formulas in the following way:

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle \diamond \rangle_p^q &= \exists \varepsilon : \{1 \leq p\}. \forall \alpha. \alpha \multimap \alpha \\
\langle \mathbf{N} \rangle_p^q &= \mathbf{N}_p \\
\langle A \otimes B \rangle_p^q &= \exists (x, y) : \{x + y \leq p\}. \langle A \rangle_x^q \otimes \langle B \rangle_y^q \\
\langle A \multimap B \rangle_p^q &= \forall (x) : \{x + p \leq q\}. \langle A \rangle_x^q \multimap \langle B \rangle_{p+x}^q
\end{aligned}$$

Please observe that the interpretation of any LFPL is parametrized on two resource polynomials p and q . If a variable x occurs in p , but not in q , then x occurs only positively in $\langle A \rangle_p^q$: this is an easy induction on the structure of A .

The correspondence scales to proofs:

Theorem 6.1 *LFPL can be embedded into QBAL. In other words, for every LFPL proof $\pi : A_1, \dots, A_n \vdash B$, there exists a QBAL proof*

$$\langle \pi \rangle : \langle A_1 \rangle_{x_1}^y, \dots, \langle A_n \rangle_{x_n}^y \vdash_{\{\sum_i x_i \leq y, 1 \leq y\}} \langle B \rangle_{\sum_i x_i}^y$$

such that $\llbracket \pi \rrbracket = \llbracket \langle \pi \rangle \rrbracket$. Moreover, the correspondence $\langle \cdot \rangle$ is weakly compositional.

Proof. As expected, the proof goes by induction on π .

- Successor:

$$\frac{\pi : \langle \mathbf{N} \rangle_y^b \vdash_{\{x+y \leq b, 1 \leq b, 1 \leq x\}} \langle \mathbf{N} \rangle_{x+y}^b}{1, \langle \mathbf{N} \rangle_y^b \vdash_{\{x+y \leq b, 1 \leq b, 1 \leq x\}} \langle \mathbf{N} \rangle_{x+y}^b} L_1$$

$$\frac{\langle \diamond \rangle_x^b, \langle \mathbf{N} \rangle_y^b \vdash_{\{x+y \leq b, 1 \leq b\}} \langle \mathbf{N} \rangle_{x+y}^b}{\langle \diamond \rangle_x^b, \langle \mathbf{N} \rangle_y^b \vdash_{\{x+y \leq b, 1 \leq b\}} \langle \mathbf{N} \rangle_{x+y}^b} L_{\exists x}$$

- Application:

$$\frac{\pi : \langle \Gamma \rangle_{\overline{x}}^b \vdash_{\{\sum_i x_i + \sum_i y_i \leq b, 1 \leq b\}} \langle A \multimap B \rangle_{\sum_i x_i}^b}{\frac{\langle \Gamma \rangle_{\overline{x}}^b \vdash_{\{\sum_i x_i + \sum_i y_i \leq b, 1 \leq b\}} \langle A \rangle_{\sum_i y_i}^b \multimap \langle B \rangle_{\sum_i x_i + \sum_i y_i}^b \quad \rho : \langle \Delta \rangle_{\overline{y}}^b \vdash_{\{\sum_i x_i + \sum_i y_i \leq b, 1 \leq b\}} \langle A \rangle_{\sum_i y_i}^b}{\langle \Gamma \rangle_{\overline{x}}^b, \langle \Delta \rangle_{\overline{y}}^b \vdash_{\{\sum_i x_i + \sum_i y_i \leq b, 1 \leq b\}} \langle B \rangle_{\sum_i x_i + \sum_i y_i}^b} R_{\multimap}}$$

- Abstraction:

$$\frac{\pi : \langle \Gamma \rangle_{\overline{x}}^b, \langle A \rangle_y^b \vdash_{\{\sum_i x_i \leq b, \sum_i x_i + y \leq b, 1 \leq b\}} \langle B \rangle_{\sum_i x_i + y}^b}{\langle \Gamma \rangle_{\overline{x}}^b \vdash_{\{\sum_i x_i \leq b, \sum_i x_i + y \leq b, 1 \leq b\}} \langle A \rangle_y^b \multimap \langle B \rangle_{\sum_i x_i + y}^b} R_{\multimap}$$

$$\frac{\langle \Gamma \rangle_{\overline{x}}^b \vdash_{\{\sum_i x_i \leq b, 1 \leq b\}} \langle A \multimap B \rangle_{\sum_i x_i}^b}{\langle \Gamma \rangle_{\overline{x}}^b \vdash_{\{\sum_i x_i \leq b, 1 \leq b\}} \langle A \multimap B \rangle_{\sum_i x_i}^b} R_{\forall x}$$

- Let:

$$\frac{\langle \Gamma \rangle_{\overline{x}}^b, \langle A \rangle_y^b, \langle B \rangle_z^b \vdash_{\{\sum_i x_i + w \leq b, 1 \leq b, y + z \leq w\}} \langle C \rangle_{\sum_i x_i + w}^b}{\langle \Gamma \rangle_{\overline{x}}^b, \langle A \rangle_y^b \otimes \langle B \rangle_z^b \vdash_{\{\sum_i x_i + w \leq b, 1 \leq b, y + z \leq w\}} \langle C \rangle_{\sum_i x_i + w}^b} L_{\otimes}$$

$$\frac{\langle \Gamma \rangle_{\overline{x}}^b, \langle A \otimes B \rangle_w^b \vdash_{\{\sum_i x_i + w \leq b, 1 \leq b\}} \langle C \rangle_{\sum_i x_i + w}^b}{\langle \Gamma \rangle_{\overline{x}}^b, \langle A \otimes B \rangle_w^b \vdash_{\{\sum_i x_i + w \leq b, 1 \leq b\}} \langle C \rangle_{\sum_i x_i + w}^b} L_{\exists x}$$

- Pairs:

$$\frac{\langle \Gamma \rangle_{\overline{x}}^b \vdash_{\{\sum_i x_i \leq b, \sum_i y_i \leq b, 1 \leq b\}} \langle A \rangle_{\sum_i x_i}^b \quad \langle \Delta \rangle_{\overline{y}}^b \vdash_{\{\sum_i x_i \leq b, \sum_i y_i \leq b, 1 \leq b\}} \langle B \rangle_{\sum_i y_i}^b}{\langle \Gamma \rangle_{\overline{x}}^b, \langle \Delta \rangle_{\overline{y}}^b \vdash_{\{\sum_i x_i \leq b, \sum_i y_i \leq b, 1 \leq b\}} \langle A \rangle_{\sum_i x_i}^b \otimes \langle B \rangle_{\sum_i y_i}^b} R_{\otimes}$$

$$\frac{\langle \Gamma \rangle_{\overline{x}}^b, \langle \Delta \rangle_{\overline{y}}^b \vdash_{\{\sum_i x_i \leq b, \sum_i y_i \leq b, 1 \leq b\}} \langle A \otimes B \rangle_{\sum_i x_i + \sum_i y_i}^b}{\langle \Gamma \rangle_{\overline{x}}^b, \langle \Delta \rangle_{\overline{y}}^b \vdash_{\{\sum_i x_i \leq b, \sum_i y_i \leq b, 1 \leq b\}} \langle A \otimes B \rangle_{\sum_i x_i + \sum_i y_i}^b} R_{\exists x}$$

- Iteration:

$$\frac{\langle \diamond \rangle_1^b \vdash_{\{y \leq b, 1 \leq b\}} \langle A \multimap A \rangle_1^b}{\vdash_{\{y \leq b, 1 \leq b\}} \langle A \multimap A \rangle_1^b}$$

$$\frac{\vdash_{\{y \leq b, 1 \leq b\}} \langle A \rangle_y^b \multimap \langle A \rangle_{y+1}^b \quad \vdash_{\{y \leq b, 1 \leq b\}} \langle A \rangle_0^b}{\langle \mathbf{N} \rangle_y^b \vdash_{\{y \leq b, 1 \leq b\}} \langle A \rangle_y^b} L_{\text{iteration}}$$

This concludes the proof. $\square$

One may ask whether such an embedding might work for **BLL**proper. We believe this to be unlikely for several reasons. In particular, it seems that **BLL** lacks a mechanism which allows to turn the information about the size of the manipulated objects from being global to being local. In **QBAL**, this rôle is played by first order quantifiers. The way first order quantification is used in the definitions of $\langle A \otimes B \rangle_p^q$ and $\langle A \multimap B \rangle_p^q$ is illuminating, in this respect.

7 Embedding RRW

Ramified recurrence on words (RRW) is a function algebra extensionally corresponding to polynomial time functions introduced by Leivant in the early nineties [13]. Bellantoni and Cook's algebra **BC** can be easily embedded into RRW.

Given a work algebra $\mathbb{W}$, id is the identity function on $\mathbb{W}$. Given a n -ary function g on $\mathbb{W}$ and n m -ary functions $f_1, \dots, f_m$ on $\mathbb{W}$, we can define the m -ary *composition* of g and $f_1, \dots, f_m$, denoted $\text{comp}(g, f_1, \dots, f_m)$, as follows:

$$\text{comp}(g, f_1, \dots, f_m)(t_1, \dots, t_m) = g(f_1(t_1, \dots, t_m), \dots, f_m(t_1, \dots, t_m)).$$

Given an n -ary function $f_{\varepsilon_{\mathbb{W}}}$ on $\mathbb{W}$ and $n + 2$ -ary functions $f_{c_{\mathbb{W}}^1}, \dots, f_{c_{\mathbb{W}}^w}$ on $\mathbb{W}$, we can define an $n + 1$ -ary function g , denoted $\text{rec}(f_{c_{\mathbb{W}}^1}, \dots, f_{c_{\mathbb{W}}^w}, f_{\varepsilon_{\mathbb{W}}})$, by *primitive recursion* as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} g(t_1, \dots, t_n, \varepsilon_{\mathbb{W}}) &= f_{\varepsilon_{\mathbb{W}}}(t_1, \dots, t_n) \\ g(t_1, \dots, t_n, c_{\mathbb{W}}^i(t)) &= f_{c_{\mathbb{W}}^i}(t_1, \dots, t_n, g(t_1, \dots, t_n, t), t) \end{aligned}$$

Given an n -ary function $f_{\varepsilon_{\mathbb{W}}}$ on $\mathbb{W}$ and $n + 1$ -ary functions $f_{c_{\mathbb{W}}^1}, \dots, f_{c_{\mathbb{W}}^w}$ on $\mathbb{W}$, we can define an $n + 1$ -ary function g , denoted $\text{cond}(f_{c_{\mathbb{W}}^1}, \dots, f_{c_{\mathbb{W}}^w}, f_{\varepsilon_{\mathbb{W}}})$, as a *conditional* as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} g(t_1, \dots, t_n, \varepsilon_{\mathbb{W}}) &= f_{\varepsilon_{\mathbb{W}}}(t_1, \dots, t_n) \\ g(t_1, \dots, t_n, c_{\mathbb{W}}^i(t)) &= f_{c_{\mathbb{W}}^i}(t_1, \dots, t_n, t) \end{aligned}$$

Not every function obtained this way is in RRW: indeed, they correspond to primitive recursive functions on $\mathbb{W}$. In Figure 4, a formal system for judgements in the form $\vdash f : \mathbb{W}^{i_1} \times \dots \times \mathbb{W}^{i_n} \rightarrow \mathbb{W}^i$ (where $i_1, \dots, i_n, i$ are natural numbers) is defined. If such a judgement can be derived from the rules in Figure 4, then f is said to be an RRW function (the definition of RRW given here is slightly different but essentially equivalent to the original one [13]). Leivant [13] proved that RRW functions are exactly the polytime computable functions on $\mathbb{W}$. But RRW can be compositionally embedded into QBAL, at least in a weak sense:

$\frac{}{\vdash \text{id} : \mathbb{W}^i \rightarrow \mathbb{W}^i} \quad \frac{}{\vdash \varepsilon_{\mathbb{W}} : \mathbb{W}^i} \quad \frac{}{\vdash c_{\mathbb{W}} : \mathbb{W}^i \rightarrow \mathbb{W}^i} \quad \frac{j_i = j}{\vdash \pi_i^m : \mathbb{W}^{j_1} \times \dots \times \mathbb{W}^{j_m} \rightarrow \mathbb{W}^j}$
$\frac{\vdash g : \mathbb{W}^{i_1} \times \dots \times \mathbb{W}^{i_n} \rightarrow \mathbb{W}^i \quad \vdash f_k : \mathbb{W}^{j_1} \times \dots \times \mathbb{W}^{j_m} \rightarrow \mathbb{W}^{i_k}}{\vdash \text{comp}(g, f_1, \dots, f_n) : \mathbb{W}^{j_1} \times \dots \times \mathbb{W}^{j_m} \rightarrow \mathbb{W}^i}$
$\frac{\vdash f_{c_{\mathbb{W}}} : \mathbb{W}^{i_1} \times \dots \times \mathbb{W}^{i_n} \times \mathbb{W}^i \times \mathbb{W}^j \rightarrow \mathbb{W}^i \quad \vdash f_{\varepsilon} : \mathbb{W}^{i_1} \times \dots \times \mathbb{W}^{i_n} \rightarrow \mathbb{W}^i \quad i < j}{\vdash \text{rec}(f_{c_{\mathbb{W}}^1}, \dots, f_{c_{\mathbb{W}}^w}, f_{\varepsilon_{\mathbb{W}}}) : \mathbb{W}^{i_1} \times \dots \times \mathbb{W}^{i_n} \times \mathbb{W}^j \rightarrow \mathbb{W}^i}$
$\frac{\vdash f_{c_{\mathbb{W}}} : \mathbb{W}^{i_1} \times \dots \times \mathbb{W}^{i_n} \times \mathbb{W}^j \rightarrow \mathbb{W}^i \quad \vdash f_{\varepsilon} : \mathbb{W}^{i_1} \times \dots \times \mathbb{W}^{i_n} \rightarrow \mathbb{W}^i}{\vdash \text{cond}(f_{c_{\mathbb{W}}^1}, \dots, f_{c_{\mathbb{W}}^w}, f_{\varepsilon_{\mathbb{W}}}) : \mathbb{W}^{i_1} \times \dots \times \mathbb{W}^{i_n} \times \mathbb{W}^j \rightarrow \mathbb{W}^i}$

Figure 4: RRW as a formal system.

Theorem 7.1 *RRW can be embedded into QBAL. Suppose, in other words, that*

$$\pi \vdash f : \mathbb{W}^{i_1} \times \dots \times \mathbb{W}^{i_n} \rightarrow \mathbb{W}^i$$

and that $i < i_{j_1}, \dots, i_{j_m}$, while $i = i_{k_1}, \dots, i_{k_h}$. Then, there exists an QBAL proof

$$\langle \pi \rangle : \mathbf{W}_{x_1}, \dots, \mathbf{W}_{x_n} \vdash_{\{x_{k_1} \leq x, \dots, x_{k_h} \leq x\}} \mathbf{W}_{q(x_{j_1}, \dots, x_{j_m}) + x}.$$

where $(\prod_{i=1}^n \psi_{\mathbb{W}}) \circ \llbracket \pi \rrbracket \circ \varphi_{\mathbb{W}} = f$. Moreover, $\langle \cdot \rangle$ is weakly compositional.

Proof. By induction on the proof of

$$\vdash f : \mathbb{W}^{i_1} \times \dots \times \mathbb{W}^{i_n} \rightarrow \mathbb{W}^i.$$

- Consider the identity function id . Clearly:

$$\frac{}{\mathbf{W}_{x_1} \vdash_{\{x_1 \leq x\}} \mathbf{W}_x}$$

- Suppose $f = \text{comp}(g, f_1, \dots, f_n)$ and

$$\frac{\vdash g : \mathbb{W}^{i_1} \times \dots \times \mathbb{W}^{i_n} \rightarrow \mathbb{W}^i \quad \vdash f_k : \mathbb{W}^{j_1} \times \dots \times \mathbb{W}^{j_m} \rightarrow \mathbb{W}^{i_k}}{\vdash \text{comp}(g, f_1, \dots, f_n) : \mathbb{W}^{j_1} \times \dots \times \mathbb{W}^{j_m} \rightarrow \mathbb{W}^i}$$

We partition the sequence $i_1, \dots, i_n$ into three sequences containing elements which are equal to i , strictly smaller than i and strictly greater than i , respectively:

$$\begin{aligned} & i_{k_1}, \dots, i_{k_h} \\ & i_{u_1}, \dots, i_{u_v} \\ & i_{a_1}, \dots, i_{a_b} \end{aligned}$$

Clearly, $n = h + v + b$. Similarly for the sequence $j_1, \dots, j_m$:

$$\begin{aligned} & j_{t_1}, \dots, j_{t_e} \\ & j_{z_1}, \dots, j_{z_d} \\ & j_{c_1}, \dots, j_{c_l} \end{aligned}$$

Clearly, $m = e + d + l$. By induction hypothesis, there are proofs $\pi_g, \pi_{f_1}, \pi_{f_n}$ with the appropriate conclusions. Now, consider the proofs $\pi_{f_{k_1}}, \dots, \pi_{f_{k_h}}$: they are the ones such that $i = i_{k_1}, \dots, i_{k_h}$. By Proposition 2.2, we can assume that their conclusion is exactly the same, i.e., the polynomials $r_{k_1}, \dots, r_{k_h}$ in the rhs are indeed the same polynomial r . In other words, we have proofs

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_{f_{k_1}} & : \mathbf{W}_{x_1}, \dots, \mathbf{W}_{x_m} \vdash_{x_{t_1} \leq x, \dots, x_{t_e} \leq x} \mathbf{W}_{q_{k_1}}(x_1, \dots, x_m, x) \\ & \vdots \\ \rho_{f_{k_h}} & : \mathbf{W}_{x_1}, \dots, \mathbf{W}_{x_m} \vdash_{x_{t_1} \leq x, \dots, x_{t_e} \leq x} \mathbf{W}_{q_{k_h}}(x_1, \dots, x_m, x) \end{aligned}$$

where $q_{k_o}(x_1, \dots, x_m, x) = r(x_{z_1}, \dots, x_{z_d}) + x$ for every o . Consider the proofs $\pi_{f_{u_1}}, \dots, \pi_{f_{u_v}}$: they are the ones such that $i < i_{u_1}, \dots, i_{u_v}$. Observe that $x_{t_1}, \dots, x_{t_e}$ do not appear anywhere in their conclusions. By Proposition 2.3 and Proposition 2.1, we can obtain proofs:

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_{f_{u_1}} & : \mathbf{W}_{x_1}, \dots, \mathbf{W}_{x_m} \vdash_{x_{t_1} \leq x, \dots, x_{t_e} \leq x} \mathbf{W}_{q_{u_1}}(x_1, \dots, x_m, x) \\ & \vdots \\ \rho_{f_{u_v}} & : \mathbf{W}_{x_1}, \dots, \mathbf{W}_{x_m} \vdash_{x_{t_1} \leq x, \dots, x_{t_e} \leq x} \mathbf{W}_{q_{u_v}}(x_1, \dots, x_m, x) \end{aligned}$$

where $q_{u_1}, \dots, q_{u_v}$ only depend on $x_{z_1}, \dots, x_{z_d}$. Similarly, we can obtain proofs

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_{f_{a_1}} & : \mathbf{W}_{x_1}, \dots, \mathbf{W}_{x_m} \vdash_{x_{t_1} \leq x, \dots, x_{t_e} \leq x} \mathbf{W}_{q_{a_1}}(x_1, \dots, x_m, x) \\ & \vdots \\ \rho_{f_{a_b}} & : \mathbf{W}_{x_1}, \dots, \mathbf{W}_{x_m} \vdash_{x_{t_1} \leq x, \dots, x_{t_e} \leq x} \mathbf{W}_{q_{a_b}}(x_1, \dots, x_m, x) \end{aligned}$$

corresponding to $\pi_{f_{a_1}}, \dots, \pi_{f_{a_b}}$. Consider the proof π_g . By Proposition 2.3, we can obtain a proof

$$\rho_g : \mathbf{W}_{q_1(x_1, \dots, x_m, x)}, \dots, \mathbf{W}_{q_n(x_1, \dots, x_m, x)} \vdash_{x_{t_1} \leq x, \dots, x_{t_e} \leq x} \mathbf{W}_{p(x_{z_1}, \dots, x_{z_d}) + x}$$

Plugging the obtained proofs and remembering that base types are duplicable, we can construct a proof corresponding to $f = \text{comp}(g, f_1, \dots, f_n)$:

$$\frac{\frac{\rho_g \quad \rho_{f_1} \quad \dots \quad \rho_{f_n}}{\mathbf{W}_{x_1}, \dots, \mathbf{W}_{x_m} \vdash_{x_{t_1} \leq x, \dots, x_{t_e} \leq x} \mathbf{W}_{p(x_{z_1}, \dots, x_{z_d}) + x}}}{\mathbf{W}_{x_1}, \dots, \mathbf{W}_{x_m} \vdash_{x_{t_1} \leq x, \dots, x_{t_e} \leq x} \mathbf{W}_{p(x_{z_1}, \dots, x_{z_d}) + x}}$$

- Suppose $f = \text{rec}(f_{c_{\mathbb{W}}^1}, \dots, f_{c_{\mathbb{W}}^w}, f_{\varepsilon_{\mathbb{W}}})$ and

$$\frac{\vdash f_{c_{\mathbb{W}}^k} : \mathbb{W}^{i_1} \times \dots \times \mathbb{W}^{i_n} \times \mathbb{W}^i \times \mathbb{W}^j \rightarrow \mathbb{W}^i \quad \vdash f_{\varepsilon} : \mathbb{W}^{i_1} \times \dots \times \mathbb{W}^{i_n} \rightarrow \mathbb{W}^i \quad i < j}{\vdash \text{rec}(f_{c_{\mathbb{W}}^1}, \dots, f_{c_{\mathbb{W}}^w}, f_{\varepsilon_{\mathbb{W}}}) : \mathbb{W}^{i_1} \times \dots \times \mathbb{W}^{i_n} \times \mathbb{W}^j \rightarrow \mathbb{W}^i}$$

By induction hypothesis, there are proofs π_{ε} and $\pi_{\mathbb{W}}^1, \dots, \pi_{\mathbb{W}}^w$ with the appropriate conclusions. By Proposition 2.2 we can assume that:

$$\begin{aligned} \pi_{\varepsilon} &: \mathbf{W}_{x_1}, \dots, \mathbf{W}_{x_n} \vdash_{\mathcal{C}} \mathbf{W}_{q(x_{j_1}, \dots, x_{j_m}, 0) + x} \\ \pi_1 &: \mathbf{W}_{x_1}, \dots, \mathbf{W}_{x_{n+2}} \vdash_{\mathcal{C} \cup \{x_{n+1} \leq x\}} \mathbf{W}_{q(x_{j_1}, \dots, x_{j_m}, x_{n+2}) + x} \\ &\vdots \\ \pi_w &: \mathbf{W}_{x_1}, \dots, \mathbf{W}_{x_{n+2}} \vdash_{\mathcal{C} \cup \{x_{n+1} \leq x\}} \mathbf{W}_{q(x_{j_1}, \dots, x_{j_m}, x_{n+2}) + x} \end{aligned}$$

where $\mathcal{C} = \{x_{k_1} \leq x, \dots, x_{k_h} \leq x\}$ and q is a fixed resource polynomial. Applying the substitution

$$\begin{aligned} x &\mapsto (y+1)q + x \\ x_{n+1} &\mapsto (y+1)q + x \\ x_{n+2} &\mapsto y \end{aligned}$$

to $\pi_1, \dots, \pi_w$ and by using Proposition 2.2 and Proposition 2.1, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_1 &: \mathbf{W}_{x_1}, \dots, \mathbf{W}_{x_n}, \mathbf{W}_{(y+1)q(x_{j_1}, \dots, x_{j_m}, y)}, \mathbf{W}_y \vdash_{\mathcal{C}} \mathbf{W}_{(y+2)q(x_{j_1}, \dots, x_{j_m}, y+1) + x} \\ &\vdots \\ \rho_w &: \mathbf{W}_{x_1}, \dots, \mathbf{W}_{x_n}, \mathbf{W}_{(y+1)q(x_{j_1}, \dots, x_{j_m}, y)}, \mathbf{W}_y \vdash_{\mathcal{C}} \mathbf{W}_{(y+2)q(x_{j_1}, \dots, x_{j_m}, y+1) + x} \end{aligned}$$

For simplicity, we use the following abbreviations:

$$\begin{aligned} A &= \mathbf{W}_{x_1} \otimes \dots \otimes \mathbf{W}_{x_n} \\ B &= \mathbf{W}_{x_1} \multimap \dots \multimap \mathbf{W}_{x_n} \multimap (A \otimes \mathbf{W}_{(y+1)q(x_{j_1}, \dots, x_{j_m}, y) + x} \otimes \mathbf{W}_y) \\ \Delta &= \mathbf{W}_{x_1}, \dots, \mathbf{W}_{x_n} \end{aligned}$$

Now, from π_{ε} and from a proof corresponding to $\varepsilon_{\mathbb{W}}$ (with conclusion $\vdash_{\mathcal{C}} \mathbf{W}_0$), we construct σ_{ε} as follows:

$$\frac{\frac{\overline{\mathbf{W}_{x_1} \vdash_{\mathcal{C}} \mathbf{W}_{x_1}} \quad \dots \quad \overline{\mathbf{W}_{x_n} \vdash_{\mathcal{C}} \mathbf{W}_{x_n}} \quad \pi_{\varepsilon} : \Delta \vdash_{\mathcal{C}} \mathbf{W}_{q(x_{j_1}, \dots, x_{j_m}, 0) + x} \quad \overline{\vdash_{\mathcal{C}} \mathbf{W}_0}}{\Delta, \Delta \vdash_{\mathcal{C}} A \otimes \mathbf{W}_{q(x_{j_1}, \dots, x_{j_m}, 0) + x} \otimes \mathbf{W}_0}}{\frac{\Delta \vdash_{\mathcal{C}} A \otimes \mathbf{W}_{q(x_{j_1}, \dots, x_{j_m}, 0) + x} \otimes \mathbf{W}_0}}{\vdash_{\mathcal{C}} B[y \leftarrow 0]}}$$

Similarly, from ρ_i and from a proof corresponding to $c_{\mathbb{W}}^i$ (with conclusion $\mathbf{W}_y \vdash_{\mathcal{C}} \mathbf{W}_y$), we construct σ_i as follows:

$$\frac{\frac{\overline{A \vdash_{\mathcal{C}} A} \quad \rho_i : \Delta, \mathbf{W}_{(y+1)q(x_{j_1}, \dots, x_{j_m}, y) + x}, \mathbf{W}_y \vdash_{\mathcal{C}} \mathbf{W}_{(y+2)q(x_{j_1}, \dots, x_{j_m}, y+1) + x} \quad \overline{\mathbf{W}_y \vdash_{\mathcal{C}} \mathbf{W}_{y+1}}}{\frac{A, \mathbf{W}_{(y+1)q(x_{j_1}, \dots, x_{j_m}, y) + x}, \mathbf{W}_y, \mathbf{W}_y, \Delta \vdash_{\mathcal{C}} A \otimes \mathbf{W}_{(y+2)q(x_{j_1}, \dots, x_{j_m}, y+1) + x} \otimes \mathbf{W}_{y+1}}{B, \Delta, \Delta \vdash_{\mathcal{C}} A \otimes \mathbf{W}_{(y+2)q(x_{j_1}, \dots, x_{j_m}, y+1) + x} \otimes \mathbf{W}_{y+1}}}}{\frac{B, \Delta \vdash_{\mathcal{C}} A \otimes \mathbf{W}_{(y+2)q(x_{j_1}, \dots, x_{j_m}, y+1) + x} \otimes \mathbf{W}_{y+1}}{\vdash_{\mathcal{C}} B \multimap B[y \leftarrow y+1]}}$$

And now we are ready to iterate over the step functions:

$$\frac{\frac{\frac{\sigma_\varepsilon \quad \sigma_1 \quad \dots \quad \sigma_w}{\mathbf{W}_{x_{n+1}} \vdash_{\mathcal{C}} B[y \leftarrow x_{n+1}]}}{\mathbf{W}_{x_{n+1}} \vdash_{\mathcal{C}} B[y \leftarrow x_{n+1}]}} \quad \frac{}{\Delta, B[y \leftarrow x_{n+1}] \vdash_{\mathcal{C}} \mathbf{W}_{(x_{n+1}+1)q(x_{j_1}, \dots, x_{j_m}, x_{n+1})+x}}}{\Delta, \mathbf{W}_{x_{n+1}} \vdash_{\mathcal{C}} \mathbf{W}_{(x_{n+1}+1)q(x_{j_1}, \dots, x_{j_m}, x_{n+1})+x}}$$

- Suppose $f = \text{cond}(f_{c_{\mathbb{W}}^1}, \dots, f_{c_{\mathbb{W}}^w}, f_{\varepsilon_{\mathbb{W}}})$ and

$$\frac{\vdash f_{c_{\mathbb{W}}^1} : \mathbb{W}^{i_1} \times \dots \times \mathbb{W}^{i_n} \times \mathbb{W}^j \rightarrow \mathbb{W}^i \quad \vdash f_{\varepsilon} : \mathbb{W}^{i_1} \times \dots \times \mathbb{W}^{i_n} \rightarrow \mathbb{W}^i}{\vdash \text{cond}(f_{c_{\mathbb{W}}^1}, \dots, f_{c_{\mathbb{W}}^w}, f_{\varepsilon_{\mathbb{W}}}) : \mathbb{W}^{i_1} \times \dots \times \mathbb{W}^{i_n} \times \mathbb{W}^j \rightarrow \mathbb{W}^i}$$

We can distinguish three subcases:

- If $i < j$, there are proofs π_ε and $\pi_{\mathbb{W}}^1, \dots, \pi_{\mathbb{W}}^w$ with the appropriate conclusions. By Proposition 2.2 we can assume that:

$$\begin{aligned} \pi_\varepsilon & : \quad \mathbf{W}_{x_1}, \dots, \mathbf{W}_{x_n} \vdash_{\mathcal{C}} \mathbf{W}_{q(x_{j_1}, \dots, x_{j_m}, 0)+x} \\ \pi_1 & : \quad \mathbf{W}_{x_1}, \dots, \mathbf{W}_{x_{n+1}} \vdash_{\mathcal{C}} \mathbf{W}_{q(x_{j_1}, \dots, x_{j_m}, x_{n+1})+x} \\ & \vdots \\ \pi_w & : \quad \mathbf{W}_{x_1}, \dots, \mathbf{W}_{x_{n+1}} \vdash_{\mathcal{C}} \mathbf{W}_{q(x_{j_1}, \dots, x_{j_m}, x_{n+1})+x} \end{aligned}$$

where $\mathcal{C} = \{x_{k_1} \leq x, \dots, x_{k_h} \leq x\}$. Applying the substitution $x_{n+1} \mapsto y$ to $\pi_1, \dots, \pi_w$ and by using Proposition 2.2 and Proposition 2.1, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_1 & : \quad \mathbf{W}_{x_1}, \dots, \mathbf{W}_{x_n}, \mathbf{W}_y \vdash_{\mathcal{C}} \mathbf{W}_{q(x_{j_1}, \dots, x_{j_m}, y+1)+x} \\ & \vdots \\ \rho_w & : \quad \mathbf{W}_{x_1}, \dots, \mathbf{W}_{x_n}, \mathbf{W}_y \vdash_{\mathcal{C}} \mathbf{W}_{q(x_{j_1}, \dots, x_{j_m}, y+1)+x} \end{aligned}$$

For simplicity, we use the following abbreviations:

$$\begin{aligned} A & = \mathbf{W}_{x_1} \otimes \dots \otimes \mathbf{W}_{x_n} \\ B & = \mathbf{W}_{x_1} \multimap \dots \multimap \mathbf{W}_{x_n} \multimap (A \otimes \mathbf{W}_{q(x_{j_1}, \dots, x_{j_m}, y)+x} \otimes \mathbf{W}_y) \\ \Delta & = \mathbf{W}_{x_1}, \dots, \mathbf{W}_{x_n} \end{aligned}$$

Now, from π_ε and from a proof corresponding to $\varepsilon_{\mathbb{W}}$ (with conclusion $\vdash_{\mathcal{C}} \mathbf{W}_0$), we construct σ_ε as follows:

$$\frac{\frac{\frac{\overline{\mathbf{W}_{x_1} \vdash_{\mathcal{C}} \mathbf{W}_{x_1}} \quad \dots \quad \overline{\mathbf{W}_{x_n} \vdash_{\mathcal{C}} \mathbf{W}_{x_n}} \quad \pi_\varepsilon : \Delta \vdash_{\mathcal{C}} \mathbf{W}_{q(x_{j_1}, \dots, x_{j_m}, 1)+x}}{\Delta, \Delta \vdash_{\mathcal{C}} A \otimes \mathbf{W}_{q(x_{j_1}, \dots, x_{j_m}, 1)+x} \otimes \mathbf{W}_0}}{\frac{\Delta \vdash_{\mathcal{C}} A \otimes \mathbf{W}_{q(x_{j_1}, \dots, x_{j_m}, 1)+x} \otimes \mathbf{W}_0}}{\vdash_{\mathcal{C}} B[y \leftarrow 0]}}$$

Similarly, from ρ_i and from a proof corresponding to $c_{\mathbb{W}}^i$ (with conclusion $\mathbf{W}_y \vdash_{\mathcal{C}} \mathbf{W}_y$), we construct σ_i as follows:

$$\frac{\frac{\frac{\overline{A \vdash_{\mathcal{C}} A} \quad \rho_i : \Delta, \mathbf{W}_y \vdash_{\mathcal{C}} \mathbf{W}_{q(x_{j_1}, \dots, x_{j_m}, y+1)+x} \quad \overline{\mathbf{W}_y \vdash_{\mathcal{C}} \mathbf{W}_{y+1}}}{A, \mathbf{W}_{q(x_{j_1}, \dots, x_{j_m}, y)+x}, \mathbf{W}_y, \mathbf{W}_y, \Delta \vdash_{\mathcal{C}} A \otimes \mathbf{W}_{q(x_{j_1}, \dots, x_{j_m}, y+1)+x} \otimes \mathbf{W}_{y+1}}}{B, \Delta, \Delta \vdash_{\mathcal{C}} A \otimes \mathbf{W}_{q(x_{j_1}, \dots, x_{j_m}, y+1)+x} \otimes \mathbf{W}_{y+1}}}{\frac{B, \Delta \vdash_{\mathcal{C}} A \otimes \mathbf{W}_{q(x_{j_1}, \dots, x_{j_m}, y+1)+x} \otimes \mathbf{W}_{y+1}}{\vdash_{\mathcal{C}} B \multimap B[y \leftarrow y+1]}}$$

And now we are ready to iterate over the step functions:

$$\frac{\frac{\sigma_\varepsilon \quad \sigma_1 \quad \dots \quad \sigma_w}{\mathbf{W}_{x_{n+1}} \vdash_{\mathcal{C}} B[y \leftarrow x_{n+1}]}}{\mathbf{W}_{x_{n+1}} \vdash_{\mathcal{C}} B[y \leftarrow x_{n+1}]} \quad \frac{}{\Delta, B[y \leftarrow x_{n+1}] \vdash_{\mathcal{C}} \mathbf{W}_{q(x_{j_1}, \dots, x_{j_m}, x_{n+1})+x}}$$

$$\frac{}{\Delta, \mathbf{W}_{x_{n+1}} \vdash_{\mathcal{C}} \mathbf{W}_{q(x_{j_1}, \dots, x_{j_m}, x_{n+1})+x}}$$

- If $i = j$, there are proofs π_ε and $\pi_{\mathbb{W}}^1, \dots, \pi_{\mathbb{W}}^w$ with the appropriate conclusions. By Proposition 2.2 we can assume that:

$$\begin{aligned} \pi_\varepsilon & : \quad \mathbf{W}_{x_1}, \dots, \mathbf{W}_{x_n} \vdash_{\mathcal{C}} \mathbf{W}_{q(x_{j_1}, \dots, x_{j_m}, 0)+x} \\ \pi_1 & : \quad \mathbf{W}_{x_1}, \dots, \mathbf{W}_{x_{n+1}} \vdash_{\mathcal{D}} \mathbf{W}_{q(x_{j_1}, \dots, x_{j_m})+x} \\ & \vdots \\ \pi_w & : \quad \mathbf{W}_{x_1}, \dots, \mathbf{W}_{x_{n+1}} \vdash_{\mathcal{D}} \mathbf{W}_{q(x_{j_1}, \dots, x_{j_m})+x} \end{aligned}$$

where $\mathcal{C} = \{x_{k_1} \leq x, \dots, x_{k_h} \leq x\}$ and $\mathcal{D} = \mathcal{C} \cup \{x_{n+1} \leq x\}$. Applying the substitution $x_{n+1} \mapsto y$ to $\pi_1, \dots, \pi_w$ and by using Proposition 2.2 and Proposition 2.1, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_1 & : \quad \mathbf{W}_{x_1}, \dots, \mathbf{W}_{x_n}, \mathbf{W}_y \vdash_{\mathcal{E}} \mathbf{W}_{q(x_{j_1}, \dots, x_{j_m})+x} \\ & \vdots \\ \rho_w & : \quad \mathbf{W}_{x_1}, \dots, \mathbf{W}_{x_n}, \mathbf{W}_y \vdash_{\mathcal{E}} \mathbf{W}_{q(x_{j_1}, \dots, x_{j_m})+x} \end{aligned}$$

where $\mathcal{E} = \mathcal{C} \cup \{y \leq x\}$. For simplicity, we use the following abbreviations:

$$\begin{aligned} A & = \quad \mathbf{W}_{x_1} \otimes \dots \otimes \mathbf{W}_{x_n} \\ B & = \quad \mathbf{W}_{x_1} \multimap \dots \multimap \mathbf{W}_{x_n} \multimap (A \otimes \mathbf{W}_{q(x_{j_1}, \dots, x_{j_m})+x} \otimes \mathbf{W}_y) \\ \Delta & = \quad \mathbf{W}_{x_1}, \dots, \mathbf{W}_{x_n} \end{aligned}$$

Now, from π_ε and from a proof corresponding to $\varepsilon_{\mathbb{W}}$ (with conclusion $\vdash_{\mathcal{D}} \mathbf{W}_0$), we construct σ_ε as follows:

$$\frac{\frac{\overline{\mathbf{W}_{x_1} \vdash_{\mathcal{E}} \mathbf{W}_{x_1}}} \quad \dots \quad \overline{\mathbf{W}_{x_n} \vdash_{\mathcal{E}} \mathbf{W}_{x_n}} \quad \pi_\varepsilon : \Delta \vdash_{\mathcal{E}} \mathbf{W}_{q(x_{j_1}, \dots, x_{j_m})+x} \quad \overline{\vdash_{\mathcal{E}} \mathbf{W}_0}}{\frac{\Delta, \Delta \vdash_{\mathcal{E}} A \otimes \mathbf{W}_{q(x_{j_1}, \dots, x_{j_m})+x} \otimes \mathbf{W}_0}{\Delta \vdash_{\mathcal{E}} A \otimes \mathbf{W}_{q(x_{j_1}, \dots, x_{j_m})+x} \otimes \mathbf{W}_0}}}$$

$$\frac{}{\vdash_{\mathcal{D}} B[y \leftarrow 0]}$$

Similarly, from ρ_i and from a proof corresponding to $c_{\mathbb{W}}^i$ (with conclusion $\mathbf{W}_y \vdash_{\mathcal{E}} \mathbf{W}_{y+1}$), we construct σ_i as follows:

$$\frac{\frac{\overline{A \vdash_{\mathcal{E}} A} \quad \rho_i : \Delta, \mathbf{W}_y \vdash_{\mathcal{E}} \mathbf{W}_{q(x_{j_1}, \dots, x_{j_m})+x} \quad \overline{\mathbf{W}_y \vdash_{\mathcal{E}} \mathbf{W}_{y+1}}}{A, \mathbf{W}_{q(x_{j_1}, \dots, x_{j_m})+x}, \mathbf{W}_y, \mathbf{W}_y, \Delta \vdash_{\mathcal{E}} A \otimes \mathbf{W}_{q(x_{j_1}, \dots, x_{j_m})+x} \otimes \mathbf{W}_{y+1}}}{\frac{B, \Delta, \Delta \vdash_{\mathcal{E}} A \otimes \mathbf{W}_{q(x_{j_1}, \dots, x_{j_m})+x} \otimes \mathbf{W}_{y+1}}{B, \Delta \vdash_{\mathcal{E}} A \otimes \mathbf{W}_{q(x_{j_1}, \dots, x_{j_m})+x} \otimes \mathbf{W}_{y+1}}}}}$$

$$\frac{}{\vdash_{\mathcal{E}} B \multimap B[y \leftarrow y+1]}$$

And now we are ready to iterate over the step functions:

$$\frac{\frac{\sigma_i : \vdash_{\mathcal{E}} B \multimap B[y \leftarrow y+1]}{\sigma_\varepsilon : \vdash_{\mathcal{D}} B[y \leftarrow x_{n+1}]} \quad \frac{}{\mathbf{W}_{x_{n+1}} \vdash_{\mathcal{D}} B[y \leftarrow x_{n+1}]}}{\frac{\mathbf{W}_{x_{n+1}} \vdash_{\mathcal{D}} B[y \leftarrow x_{n+1}]}{\mathbf{W}_{x_{n+1}} \vdash_{\mathcal{D}} B[y \leftarrow x_{n+1}]} \quad \frac{}{\Delta, B[y \leftarrow x_{n+1}] \vdash_{\mathcal{D}} \mathbf{W}_{q(x_{j_1}, \dots, x_{j_m})+x}}}$$

$$\frac{}{\Delta, \mathbf{W}_{x_{n+1}} \vdash_{\mathcal{D}} \mathbf{W}_{q(x_{j_1}, \dots, x_{j_m})+x}}$$

- If $i > j$, the proof is similar to the case $i < j$.

Observe how, in all the three cases, the proof corresponding to f is structurally the same. This concludes the proof $\square$

8 Conclusions

We presented QBAL, a new ICC system embedding both known systems of impredicative recursion in the sense of [8]. QBAL allows to overcome the main weakness of BLL, namely that all resource variables are global. In the authors' view, this constitutes the first step towards unifying ICC systems into a single framework. The next step consists in defining an embedding of light linear logic into QBAL and the authors are currently investigating on that.

References

- [1] Andrea Asperti and Luca Roversi. Intuitionistic light affine logic. *ACM Transactions on Computational Logic*, 3(1):137–175, 2002.
- [2] Henk Barendregt. *The Lambda Calculus: Its Syntax and Semantics*. Studies in Logic and the Foundations of Mathematics. North Holland, 1984.
- [3] Stephen Bellantoni and Stephen Cook. A new recursion-theoretic characterization of the polytime functions. *Computational Complexity*, 2:97–110, 1992.
- [4] Vincent Danos and Jean-Baptiste Joinet. Linear logic and elementary time. *Information and Computation*, 183(1):123–137, 2003.
- [5] Jean-Yves Girard. Linear logic. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 50:1–102, 1987.
- [6] Jean-Yves Girard. Light linear logic. *Information and Computation*, 143(2):175–204, 1998.
- [7] Jean-Yves Girard, Andre Scedrov, and Philip Scott. Bounded linear logic: A modular approach to polynomial-time computability. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 97(1):1–66, 1992.
- [8] Martin Hofmann. Programming languages capturing complexity classes. *SIGACT News Logic Column*, 9, 2000. 12 pp.
- [9] Martin Hofmann. Linear types and non-size-increasing polynomial time computation. *Information and Computation*, 183(1):57–85, 2003.
- [10] Martin Hofmann and Philip Scott. Realizability models for BLL-like languages. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 318(1-2):121–137, 2004.
- [11] Yves Lafont. Soft linear logic and polynomial time. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 318(1-2):163–180, 2004.
- [12] Daniel Leivant. A foundational delineation of computational feasibility. In *Sixth IEEE Symposium on Logic in Computer Science, Proceedings*, pages 2–11, 1991.
- [13] Daniel Leivant. Stratified functional programs and computational complexity. In *20th Annual ACM SIGPLAN-SIGACT Symposium on Principles of Programming Languages, Proceedings*, pages 325–333, 1993.
- [14] Jean-Yves Marion and Jean-Yves Moyen. Efficient first order functional program interpreter with time bound certifications. In *Logic for Programming and Automated Reasoning, 7th International Conference, Proceedings*, pages 25–42, 2000.
- [15] Andrzej Murawski and Luke Ong. On an interpretation of safe recursion in light affine logic. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 318(1-2):197–223, 2004.
- [16] Ulrich Schöpp. Stratified bounded affine logic for logarithmic space. In *22nd IEEE Symposium on Logic in Computer Science, Proceedings*, pages 411–420, 2007.
- [17] Anne Troelstra and Helmut Schwichtenberg. *Basic proof theory*. Cambridge University Press, 1996.
- [18] Christopher Wadsworth. Some unusual λ -calculus numeral systems. In J.P. Seldin and J.R. Hindley, editors, *To H.B. Curry: Essays on Combinatory Logic, Lambda Calculus and Formalism*. Academic Press, 1980.